

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed December 26, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Related Applications

The Examiner is kindly requested to consult with other USPTO Examiners that are presently examining or have examined applications that may be considered to be related to the instant application. The prosecution records of all such related cases are easily accessible to the Examiner, either internally via the PTO web, or even through the internet (Public PAIR).

In this case, applications that may be considered to be related to the instant application include at least:

- 1) Serial No. 10/813,907
- 2) Serial No. 10/814,868
- 3) Serial No. 10/814,867

Subject Matter Indicated Allowed or Allowable

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowance of claims 14, 16, 18-22, 27-28, 30, 33, 39-44, 49, 50, 54-55, 74-84, 87-99 and 102-113.

Canceled Claims

Non-allowed claims 1-7, 85-86 and 100-101 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Claim Objections

Claims 85, 86, 100 and 101 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. These claims are cancelled by this amendment and, accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this objection is now moot.

Objection to the Specification

According to the Office Action, the amendment filed 10/19/07 is objected to under 35 USC 132 (a) because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. The alleged "new

matter” appears to be the amendment to claim 1. Since claim 1 has been cancelled it is believed that this objection is also now moot.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83 (a) because they allegedly do not show the features recited in cancelled claim 1. Since claim 1 stands cancelled these objections are also now believed to be moot.

Claim Rejections -- 35 USC Sec. 112

Claims 1 – 7 stand rejected under 35 USC Sec. 112 for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Since these claims are also cancelled, this rejection is also moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec. 102

Claims 1 – 2 and 4 – 6 stand rejected under 35 USC Sec. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Pascucci (USP 5854762). Since these claims are cancelled, this rejection is also moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC Sec. 103

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC Sec. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pascucci (USP 5854762) in view of Dugger et al. (USPAPN 2003/0183871). Since these claims are cancelled, this rejection is also moot.

Request for Entry of Amendment

Entry of this Amendment will place the Application in better condition for allowance, or at the least, narrow any issues for an appeal. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: February 6, 2008



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040